

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 19 and 20 have been amended. Claims 21-24 have been added. Claims 1 – 24 are pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 10, 11, 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Loving (US 6,531, 964). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In applying the claim language to the Loving reference the Examiner apparently ignored the limitation in the claim preamble that the RFID tag is separate from the keyboard. In Loving, in contrast, all the RFID tags are integrated into the same housing as the keys, not separate. To obviate this basis for the rejection, independent Claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the RFID tag is separate from and independently movable from the keyboard. Furthermore, this has been specifically recited in the body of the claims as well as the preamble. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted no reading of the claims onto the Loving reference is now possible and the rejection is fully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loving (US 6,531,964). It is respectfully submitted this rejection has been addressed by the claim amendment to Claim 10 and the above remarks and this rejection is fully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claim 12 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loving as applied to Claim 10, and further in view of Hartsell, Jr. (US 6,070,156). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed by the amendment to Claim 10 and above remarks since even assuming *arguendo* that features of Hartsell,

Jr. were incorporated in Loving, nonetheless the modified Loving device would still be an integrated structure with multiple RFID tags. Claim 10 clearly distinguishes such a combination. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted the proposed combination is purely a hindsight combination since Applicant fails to see any motivation in combining the remote control of Loving with detailed teachings directed to a gas station and retail system as in Hartsell, Jr. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted this rejection is fully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loving (US 6,531,964) in view of Peng (US 6,686,903). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended in the same manner as Claim 10 and since the base reference Loving has been applied in the same manner by the Examiner as in Claim 10, it is respectfully submitted the amendment equally overcomes this rejection for the reasons discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted the Examiner's proposed combination is motivated purely by hindsight. However, it is respectfully submitted the hindsight nature of the combination as well as the Examiner's characterization of Peng need not be further discussed since the proposed combination would still not provide the system of Claim 1 as amended. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted this rejection is fully traversed.

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loving (US 6,531,964) in view of Peng (US 6,686,903) as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Hartsell, Jr. (US 6,070,156). It is respectfully submitted this rejection has been fully traversed by the amendment to Claim 1 and above remarks.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. It is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Applicant if it appears that any impediment remains to allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9 - 26 - 05



David L. Henty
19900 MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 1150
Irvine, CA 92612
(949) 223-9654